



Mr. & Mrs. Horace H. Hix



DENVER CO 802

09 SEP 2006 PM 3:11



ADMIN RECORD

Mr. Fraser Lockhardt
Rocky Flats Environmental Tech. Site
12101 Airport Way, Unit A
B.

U.S.Department of Energy
Attention: Frazer Lockhardt
Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site
12101 Airport Way, Unit A
Broomfield, CO 80021-2583

On Aug. 31, 2006 I attended the "Public Hearing to submit comments on the Proposed Plan for Rocky Flats." I was pleased to note that there were three meetings planned with two on the 31st. I attended the three o'clock meeting at the Arvada Center.

Once the moderator began the meeting and announced the ground rules, I realized that everyone connected with this farce had no real interest in hearing what the public had to say. This was an unbelievable display of bureaucratic arrogance, which immediately made it evident that the purpose of the meeting was not to consider what the public view was, rather to fulfill a mandate to hold a public meeting. It certainly in no way reflected holding a "hearing."

When there are a great many speakers, it makes sense to have a three minute limit. Since I was the only speaker, this amount of time could have been expanded. However, I really did not have more to say as we were not allowed to comment on Stewardship issues. I find this very strange as the Proposed Plan has many comments about stewardship in it. Even more bizarre was the fact that we could not ask questions of those at the table, but had to ask questions to those in the back of the room. Who has EVER heard of a "hearing" where questions could not be asked?

Before announcing the rules, the moderator announced that copies of the FRETs Proposed Plan, July 2006, and the four page "Fact Sheet" were available in the lobby. Why were these not on the sign in table? I arrived early enough to have read at least the Fact sheet and part of the Summary. Upon leaving I had to request copies, which had been hidden away in boxes behind the table. Why? There was only one more meeting scheduled.

Next came the announcement that the group (bureaucrats sitting at the table) were not expecting to hear from governmental groups as they will be expected to submit written comments. This was too bad as I always am interested in hearing what my elected officials, their delegates, and the experts are thinking.

This charade was a public meeting, NOT a public hearing!

I stated at the public meeting that I would send my stewardship related comments in writing.

My comment is: Both the cities of Westminster and Broomfield have protected the citizens of the downstream communities through their active oversight role. This CAD/ROD document needs to be revised to include the same language as is found in the RFCA and the post closure RFCA.

I also wanted to ask why DOE cannot afford to fence the off site monitoring equipment which is so essential to protecting downstream communities. Surely money cannot be a concern. With enough money to hire an outside firm to manage the bogus meetings, and the large sum paid to Kaiser-Hill for the early clean up, there must be money for a few fences to enclose vital equipment, which the federal government should be required to build and maintain! Why should this be a local expense? I couldn't ask that question at the meeting.

I understand that at the six o'clock meeting my statement about the fence was not correctly quoted. I said, "The fences need to be a regulatory mandate identified in post RFCA. It should not be a "best management practice." Having now read the Summary I would like to add that all fences should be given legal status and maintained by the federal government whether they are on COU or POU. You cannot prove with a certainty that the POU'S are safe/ free of contaminants.

I was very disturbed when I read on page 2 of the Fact Sheet that "The Peripheral Operable Units is safe for all uses." This statement is OPINION, not fact! In fact the entire cleanup, out of necessity, is based on educated and in some cases, not so educated assumptions. Assumptions are NOT facts. Many citizens do not agree that the clean up is protective of human health and that wide spread use of the POU is safe for all activities. Even your own publication shows that the Remedial Action Objectives have not been met. On pages 18 and 19, of the Summary, we find that only one out of three of the objectives have been met. On page 18 under objective 2 you state that restoring contaminated groundwater to beneficial use will be done, "whenever practicable in a reasonable time frame." Had someone from the public wanted to know the definitions for "reasonable time frame" or "practicable" they could not have asked. I would like a definition for both. Then, under "Status" DOE admits to not meeting the requirements at all Sentinel wells, and that no other action can be "reasonably" done.

There are reports that the original landfill cap has seeps on the surface. Why weren't the recommendations in the Dwyer report followed?

When the instituted protective measures used to date, are inoperable, how is the public supposed to believe that the area is safe now, or ever?

At the meeting I was told that I could, in this written comment, make recommendations about the placement and the wording of the signage. This is my comment: Signs and the language on the signs should be a large part of the public discussion. I believe that all interested member of the public should be engaged in this discussion, not only the LSO. I realize that this does not make the development community happy, but everyone needs to be made aware of the potential dangers. The public needs to know that what you cannot see may be dangerous to your health.

I have the feeling that if the public was aware of how the 10,000 samples that were taken was evaluated, they would be a good deal less confident about their safety. A lengthy brochure should include a history of the site as written in the Summary (p3), not the

opinion piece in the Fact Sheet, plus an explanation of "averaging". The brochure should show the number of acres in the buffer zone and tell how many samples were taken in that area, followed by an explanation of how many acres are in the industrial site and how many samples were taken there. Then there needs to be an explanation of averaging. There should be signs with all of this information at every trail head. Other signs should have warnings that say, "Plutonium has a half life of 24,000 years and can be inhaled."

There are many more warnings which should be posted every fifty feet, but as I said before, this needs to be a wide open public process with large participation. However, given your past performance at public meetings and the fact that you wish to wrap this up by Sept. 30, I know that the sign discussion will not happen.

From the beginning RFCLOG meetings in 1999, it was made clear to all that the entire area, both the OU and the POU would never be able to be cleaned up enough to allow any safe use. The Refuge Act of 2000 allowed for public hearings which also turned out to be a sham as plan "C" had already been decided on by the developers. The dangers were not allowed to be discussed, and the participants (non-political) were in favor of a far more restrictive use of the land.

All in all this has been a very disappointing process and one which creates only cynicism in the public view of government and politicians.

Sincerely,

Hildegard Hix
Hildegard Hix

